Court Fees (Amendment) Bill, 1954 which was published in the *Mysore Gazette* (Extraordinary) dated 6th March 1954 under Rule 48 of the Rules of procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—I beg to introduce :

(1) The Mysore Land Revenue and Water Rate (Increase of Levy) Bill, 1954 ;
(2) The Mysore Stamp (Amendment) Bill, 1954 ;
(3) The Mysore Sales-Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1954 ;
(4) The Mysore Irrigation (Second Amendment) Bill, 1954 ;
(5) The Madras General Sales Tax (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1954,

which have been published in the *Mysore Gazette*, dated 6th March 1954 under Rule 48 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly.

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA (Minister for Agriculture).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg permission to introduce the Mysore Electricity (Taxation on Consumption) Amendment Blll, 1954 which was published in the *Mysore Gazette*, dated 6th March 1954 under Rule 48 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now consideration of Bills. We will continue the debate on the Mysore (Personal and Miscellaneous) Inams Abolition Bill, 1953.

MYSORE (PERSONAL AND MISCELLANEOUS) INAMS ABOLITION BILL, 1953.

Motion to consider—(contd).

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ದೇವರಾಜ ಅರಸ್ (ಹುಣಸೂರು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈಗ ನಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇರುವ ಇನಾಂ ರದ್ದಿಯಾತಿ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಿರುವ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದವುಗಳು ಯಾವುವೆಂದರೆ (1) ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಹಾಗೆ ಕ್ಯಾಸಿಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಗಳೆಂಬುದರ ಡೆಫಿನಿಷನ್ನನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಿಬಿಟ್ಟು, ಇವರೆಲ್ಲರನ್ನೂ ಆ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಗಳೆಂದರೇನು ಎಂಬ ಡೆಫಿನಿಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲೇ ಸೇರಿಸಿಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. (2) ಇನಾಂದಾರನಿಗೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಡಬಾಗಿದ್ದ ಖಾಸ್ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಎಷ್ಟು ಇತ್ತೋ ಅಷ್ಟನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರವೇ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಮೂಲ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕವಾಗಿದ್ದುದನ್ನು ಈ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಎರಡು ವಿಚಾರಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ವಾದ ವಿವಾದಗಳು ನಡೆದಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಕೆಲವರು ಆ ಮೂಲ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೇನು ಡೆಫಿನಿಷನ್ನುಗಳನ್ನು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಅಡಕಗೊಳಿಸಲಾಗಿತ್ತೋ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಆ ಡೆಫಿನಿಷನ್ನುಗಳನ್ನು ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರಬೇಕೆಂದು ವಾದಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಕಾಸಿ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಗಳೆಂಬ ಪದಗಳೂ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ವಾದಗಳಾಗಿವೆ. ಆ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರ ವರದಿಯ ಜೊತೆಯಲ್ಲೇ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿ. ಲಿಂಗಾರೆಡ್ಡಿಯವರು ಆ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬರು ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿದ್ದು ಕೊಂಡು, ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಿರುವ ಒಂದು ಡಿಸೆಂಟಿಂಗ್ ನೋಟ್ ಕೂಡ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ಡಿಸೆಂಟಿಂಗ್ ನೋಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಈ 'ಕ್ಯಾಸಿಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್' ಎಂಬ ಪದವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಹಾಕಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈ ತರಗತಿಯ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಗಳಿಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಕೊಂಬರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ನಮೂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮತ್ತು 'ಖಾಸ್‌ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ಸ್' ಎಂಬ ಡೆಫಿನಿಷನ್ನನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಲೇಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಅವರು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಜಮೀನುಗಳೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಅವರಿಗೇ ಖಾಯಂ ಆಗಿ ರಿಜಸ್ಟರ್ ಮಾಡಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿ ಒಂದು ವಾದ ಮಾಡುತ್ತ, ಶ್ರೀ ಗುಂಡಪ್ಪಗೌಡರ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ನಮೂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ತಿಳಿಸಿರುವಂತೆ ಈ ಕ್ಯಾಸಿ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಎಂಬ ಪದದ ಡೆಫಿನಿಷನ್ನನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಆವಶ್ಯಕವೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ನನಗೂ ಸಹ ಕಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಕೋಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಕ್ಯಾಸಿ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ ಎಂಬ ಪದಕ್ಕೆ ಡೆಫಿನಿಷನ್ ಯಾವುದೂ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಡ್ಡುದ್ದು ಖದೀಂ ಮತ್ತು ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ ಎಂಬ ಎರಡು ತರಗತಿಗಳವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಡೆಫಿನಿಷನ್‌ಗಳಿದ್ದವು. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಎರಡಕ್ಕೂ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಈ ಕ್ಯಾಸಿ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಎಂಬ ಒಂದು ಹೊಸ ಪದವನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀ ಗುಂಡಪ್ಪಗೌಡ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿ ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪದವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಅಗತ್ಯ.

1948ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ತಮ್ಮ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ತಯಾರು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಶಂಕೆ ಉದ್ಭವಿಸಿ, ನಾವು ಮುಂದೆ ಯಾವ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ತರುತ್ತೇವೋ ಎಂಬ ಭೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಇನಾಂದಾರರು ಆಗಲೇ ತಮ್ಮ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸನ್ನು ಓಡಿಸಿಬಿಟ್ಟು, ಆ ಜಮೀನು ಬೇಕೆಂದವರಿಗೆ ಮಾರಾಟ ಮಾಡುವುದಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇರೆ ತಮಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದಂಥ ಹೊಸಬರನ್ನು ಗುತ್ತಿಗೆದಾರರಾಗಿ ಅಥವಾ ವಾರಗಾರರಾಗಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಾಗಲಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಹಿಂದಿನಿಂದ ಗುತ್ತಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ವಾರಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸಿಗೆ ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ಮಾಡಿಯಾರು ಎಂಬ ಒಂದು ಅನುಮಾನದಿಂದ, 1948ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಿಂದ ಹಿಂದೆ 6 ವರ್ಷ ಯಾರು ಯಾರು ಸಾಗುವಳಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದರೋ ಅವರೆಲ್ಲರನ್ನೂ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಎಂದು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಆ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ಸನ್ನು ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟರ್ ಮಾಡಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಶಿಫಾರಸು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಶಿಫಾರಸನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ದೇವರಾಜ್ ಅರಸ್.)

ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಂದು ಆಜ್ಞೆ ಹೊರಡಿಸಿ ಈ ಕ್ಯಾಸಿ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ಹೊಸ ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ ಆಫ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್‌ನ್ನು ಉತ್ಪನ್ನಮಾಡಿದರು. ಈಗ ಈ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿ ವರದಿ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಆ ಕ್ಯಾಸಿ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಎಂಬ ಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಎಂಬ ಪದಗಳ ಡಿಫಿನಿಷ್ಷನ್ನು ಎನ್‌ಲಾರ್ಜ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಆ ಡೆಫಿನಿಷ್ಷನಲ್ಲಿ ಕ್ಯಾಸಿ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್‌ನ್ನು ಇಕ್ಲೂಡ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಹೊಸ ಡೆಫಿನಿಷ್ಷ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸರ್ಕಾರವವರು ನೋಟಿಫಿಕೇಷ್ಷನಿಂದ ಹಿಂದೆ 12 ವರ್ಷ ಸತತವಾಗಿ ಯಾರು ಯಾರು ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಆಗಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಆಕ್ಯುಪೆಸಿ ರೈಟ್ಸ್ ಬರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಇದರಿಂದ ವ್ಯಕ್ತವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಅನೇಕರು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ, ಆ 12 ವರ್ಷಗಳ enjoymentನ್ನು ಗುತ್ತಿಗೆದಾರರು ಅಥವಾ ವಾರಗಾರರು ಎಸ್ಟಾಬ್ಲಿಷ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ತುಂಬ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಒಂದು ಕಷ್ಟವನ್ನು ನಿವಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕ್ಯಾಸಿ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಎಂಬ ಒಂದು ಶಬ್ದವನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಅವರಿಗೂ ಪ್ರೊವಿಜ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ವಾದ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದದ್ದು. ಆ ಡೆಫಿನಿಷ್ಷನಿಂದ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ; ಅದನ್ನು retain ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿದೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಆ ಕ್ಯಾಸಿ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸನ್ನು ನಾವು ಮೊದಲು ಬಿಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದಹಾಗೇ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ (4) ಮತ್ತು (5)ನಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಪ್ರೊವೈಸೊ add ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರು—ಆ ಪ್ರೊವೈಸೋಗಳನ್ನು ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟುಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇದೆ:

"Provided that no person who has been admitted into the possession of any land by an inamdar on or after the 1st July 1948 shall, except where the Deputy Commissioner after an examination of all the circumstances otherwise directs, be entitled to be registered as occupant in respect of such lands."

ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ (4) ಮತ್ತು ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ (5) ರಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರೊವೈಸೋವನ್ನು ಪುನಃ ಈ ಬಿಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಇನಾಂದಾರರಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನು ಎಷ್ಟು ಬಿಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದು ಒಂದು ಮುಖ್ಯ ವಿಚಾರ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಇದ್ದ ಬಿಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಖಾಸ್ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಅಂದರೆ ಅಭ್ಯಿಯವರಿಗೂ 3 ವರ್ಷ ಸತತವಾಗಿ ಯಾವ ಇನಾಂದಾರ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಸ್ವಂತ ಸಾಗುವಳಿಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾನೋ ಅಂಥವನಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟರ್ ಮಾಡಿಸಿಕೊಡುವುದು ಎಂದು ನಮೂದು ಮಾಡಿತ್ತು. ಈಗ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ವರದಿ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕದೀಂ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾದ ಜಮೀನು ಮತ್ತು ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾದ ಜಮೀನು ಮತ್ತು ಇನ್ನು ಇತರ ಫಾರೆನ್ಸ್, ಗೋಮಾಳ, ಕಮ್ಯೂನಲ್ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ಸ್ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ, ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ಈ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಜಮೀನುಗಳನ್ನೂ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಉಳಿಕೆಯಾದ ಜಮೀನು ಎಲ್ಲವೂ ಕೂಡ ಇನಾಂದಾರನಿಗೆ ಸೇರತಕ್ಕದು ಎಂದು ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದು ಒಂದು ಮೂಲ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಆದ ಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಕೂಡದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಕೆಲವು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಸರಿಯಾದದ್ದು, ಇದು ನ್ಯಾಯವಾದದ್ದು, ಇನಾಂದಾರರಿಗೆ ನಾವು ಒಂದು ನ್ಯಾಯವನ್ನು ದೊರಕಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಒಂದು ಇನಾಂ ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ಕದೀಂ ಟೆನೆಂಟು ತಾನು ಸ್ವತಃ ಸಾಗುವಳಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಜಮೀನು ಇದ್ದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಗುತ್ತಿಗೆದಾರರಿಗೆ ಅಥವಾ ವಾರಗಾರರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಜಮೀನು ಸಾಗುವಳಿ ಮಾಡಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವಾಗ ಆತನಿಂದ ಆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಕಸಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವು ಯಾವ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದೇ ಇನಾಂ ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ಇನಾಂದಾರ, ಗುತ್ತಿಗೇದಾರ, ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್, ಕ್ಯಾಸಿ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟು ಇವರೆಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ ಜಮೀನೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ತನಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾದ ಜಮೀನು ಎಂದರೆ ತಾನೇ ಸ್ವಂತ ಸಾಗುವಳಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದು ಮತ್ತು ಗುತ್ತಿಗೆಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅಂಥ ಈ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಆತ ತನ್ನ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟರ್ ಮಾಡಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ನಾವು ಅದನ್ನು ಕೂಡದು ಎಂಬುದು ಯಾವ ನ್ಯಾಯ? ಇದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

ನಾವು ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಗುಂಪಿನ ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನು ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಾನೂನು ಎಂಬ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತು ಅದು ಅನುಚಿತವಾದದ್ದು. ಇನಾಂದಾರರಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ರೈತವಾರಿ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಜಮೀನ್ದಾರರಾಗಲಿ, ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿ ರೈತವಾರಿ ಪದ್ಧತಿಗೆ ಒಳಪಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಜಮೀನ್ದಾರರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಗುತ್ತಿಗೆದಾರರಿಗೆ ಸಾಗುವಳಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಂಥ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಅವರಿಂದ ಕಿತ್ತುಕೊಂಡು ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವು ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಹೀಗಿರುವಲ್ಲಿ ಇನಾಂದಾರರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುವ ಹಾಗೆ ನಾವು ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡುವುದು ಅಷ್ಟು ನ್ಯಾಯವಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಎಚ್. ಸಿ. ಲಿಂಗಾರೆಡ್ಡಿಯವರು ತಮ್ಮ ವಾದವನ್ನು ಸಮರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ, ಈ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಿಫಾರ್ಮ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ವರದಿಯ ಆಧಾರವನ್ನು ಕೋಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

"We have considered the basis for determining the lands to be allowed to be retained by the namdar as registered occupant after the village vests in Government on abolition of inam tenures. We cannot agree that the inamdar should be treated as the registered occupant of all lands other than those held by kadim tenants or permanent tenants. Such a procedure would enable him to get possession of reserved and communal lands to the detriment of the village community and would also place all the tenants-at-will at his

mercy. Wholesale eviction of tenants-at-will will create a very serious problem, which would affect the inamdar also. The majority of us have therefore come to the conclusion that personal cultivation by the inamdar, *i.e.*, cultivation by himself, by his own servants or by hired labour with his own or hired stock, should be the criterion for allowing inamdar to retain any land as the registered occupant under Government, and that the inamdar's capacity for cultivation should be judged on the basis of past performance and not on professions or plans for the future."

ಈ ರೀತಿ ಕೆಲವು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಕಾರಣಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ, ಇನಾಂದಾರನಿಗೆ ಖಾಸ್ ಜಮೀನು ಇಷ್ಟೇ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ನಮೂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

> "Such a procedure would enable him to get possession of reserved and communal lands to the detriment of the village community."

ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ಕಾರಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ 'ಕಮ್ಯೂನಲ್ ಮತ್ತು ರಿಸರ್ವ್ಡ್ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ಸ್' ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಎಂದು ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದು ಮಾಡಿದೆ.

ಎರಡನೆಯ ಅಧ್ಯಾಯದ ಮೂರನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ:

> "All rights, title and interest vesting in the inamdar including all communal lands, cultivated lands, uncultivated lands whether assessed or not, waste lands, pasture lands, forests, mines and minerals, quarries, rivers and streams, tanks and irrigation works, fisheries and ferries, shall cease and be vested absolutely in the State of Mysore free from all encumbrances."

ಈ ರೀತಿ ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ರಿಜರ್ವ್ಡ್ ಮತ್ತು ಕಮ್ಯೂನಲ್ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ಸ್ ಇನಾಮ್‌ದಾರರಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಅನುಮಾನಪಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಾರಣವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.—

> "Wholesale eviction of tenants-at-will will create a very serious problem which would affect the inamdar also."—ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ತಮ್ಮ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಬರೆಯುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ, ಟೆನೆನ್ಸಿ ಕಾನೂನು ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಜಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಈ ರೀತಿಯ ಒಂದು ಅನುಮಾನವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ, ಇನಾಮ್‌ದಾರರು ತಮ್ಮ ಕೈಕೆಳಗಿರುವ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಆಚೆಗೆ ಅಟ್ಟಬಹುದೆಂಬ ಶಂಕೆಯನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿರುವುದು ಸ್ವಾಭಾವಿಕ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬೇರೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಟೆನೆನ್ಸಿ ಕಾನೂನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್-ಅಟ್-ವಿಲ್ ತಾನೇ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಐದು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಕಾಲ ನತತವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಬಹುದಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಯಾವ ಇನಾಂದಾರರೂ ಅವನಿಂದ ಆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಕೂಡಲೇ ಕಿತ್ತುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ಖಾಸ್ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಎಂಬುದರ ಅರ್ಥ ವಿವರಣೆಯನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಹಾಕಿ, ಬಾಕಿ ಜಮೀನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಇನಾಂದಾರರಿಗೆ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾಗಿದೆ.

ಆರು ವರ್ಷಕಾಲ ಅನೂಚಾನವಾಗಿ ಯಾರು ಇನಾಮ್‌ದಾರರ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು occupancy rights ಕೊಡಬೇಕೇ ಬೇಡವೇ ಎಂಬ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀ ರಾಮರಾಯರು ದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಭಾಷಣಮಾಡಿ, ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಇದೇ ರೀತಿಯ ಒಂದು ಮೂಲತತ್ವವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳಿಗೂ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಆದುದರಿಂದ with open eyes we have to see this ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಥವಿಹೀನವಾದರೂ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಡುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಕ್ಲುಪ್ತ ಕಾಲದವರೆಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಅಥವಾ ಇನಾಂಗ್ರಾಮವಾಗಲಿ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಗುತ್ತಿಗೆದಾರ ಅಥವಾ ವಾರದಾರ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿದ್ದರೆ, ನಾಳೆ ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಬಂದರೆ, ಆತನಿಗೇ ಆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇಷ್ಟಪಟ್ಟಾಗ, ದೇಶದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಬಂದರೆ, ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಹಿಂಜರಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಆ ರೀತಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗಲೇ ನಾವು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ತಯಾರಾಗಿದ್ದೇವೆಯೇ ಎಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನಿಸಿದರೆ ಇದು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಅನುಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಕೆಲವರು ಈ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ವರದಿ retrograde ಆಗಿದೆ, ಪ್ರಗತಿದಾಯಕವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ, ಪ್ರತಿಗಾಮಿಯಾಗಿದೆ, ಇನಾಂದಾರರ ಪರವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ವರದಿಯೇನೋ ಪ್ರಗತಿದಾಯಕವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಮೊದಲು ತಂದ ಮಸೂದೆ ಪ್ರಗತಿದಾಯಕವಾಗಿದೆಯೇ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅಥವಾ ಕ್ರಾಂತಿಕಾರಕವಾಗಿದೆಯೇ ಎಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅದು ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಕ್ರಾಂತಿಕಾರಕವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಪ್ರಗತಿದಾಯಕವಾಗಿರಬಹುದು. ಕ್ರಾಂತಿಕಾರಕವಾಗಿರಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಬರಿಯ ಇನಾಮ್‌ದಾರರ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಕಾನೂನುಮಾಡಿ ಅವರಿಂದ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಕಸಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಅದನ್ನು ಕೆಲವು ಟೆನೆಂಟ್‌ಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೇ ಅದು ಕ್ರಾಂತಿಕಾರಕವೆಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿಯೂ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಇನ್ನು ಕೆಲವರು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಡಬಹುದು. ಇಡೀ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆಯನ್ನೇ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಒಂದು ceiling limit fix ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ಆಗ ಕ್ರಾಂತಿಕಾರಕ ಅಥವಾ revolutionary ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಅದೂ ಅಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನಾನೂ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಕ್ರಾಂತಿಯ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ನಮ

(ಶ್ರಿ ಡಿ. ದೇವರಾಜ್ ಅರಸ್.)

ಮನಸ್ಸಿನ ಮುಂದೆ ಚೀಣಾ ಮತ್ತು ರಷ್ಯಾ ದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಾಗಿರುವ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು, ಕ್ರಾಂತಿಕಾರಕವೇ ಅಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚಿಸಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನ ಒರೆಗಲ್ಲಬೇಲೆ ಒರೆಹಚ್ಚಿ ನೋಡಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಚೀಣಾ ಮತ್ತು ರಷ್ಯಾ ದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಸುಧಾರಣೆಯಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ನೋಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದರೂ ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಓದಿರುವ ರೀತಿ, ಅಲ್ಲಿ property ಅಥವಾ ಸ್ವತ್ತನ್ನು, ಎಲ್ಲಾ ತರಹದ ಸ್ವತ್ತನ್ನೂ ಒಟ್ಟಾಗಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಎಷ್ಟುಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಗೆ rights ಇರಬೇಕು, ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟುಮಟ್ಟಿಗಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. They have treated the problem as a whole and not in parts. ಆದರೆ ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೇ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಬೇರೆಬೇರೆಯಾಗಿ ವಿಭಾಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಗೆಹರಿಸಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

ರೈತರ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟೇ ಜಮೀನಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ, ಇತರ ವರ್ಗದ ಜನರ ಆಸ್ತಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಇರಬಹುದೆಂದುಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಅದು ಹೇಗೆ ಕ್ರಾಂತಿಕಾರಕವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ನಾವು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಒಬ್ಬ ರೈತ ತಲೆತಲಾಂತರದಿಂದ ಕಷ್ಟಪಟ್ಟು ದುಡಿದು, ತನ್ನಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಐದು ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ತನ್ನ ಶ್ರಮದಿಂದ ಹತ್ತು ಅಥವಾ ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತು ಎಕರೆಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಿಕೊಂಡರೆ, ನಾಳೆ ಕಾನೂನುಮಾಡಿ ಅಷ್ಟಿರಬಾರದು, ಹತ್ತೆಕರೆಗೆ ಮೇಲಿರಬಾರದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ, ಆಗಲಿ ಆರೀತಿ ಮಾಡೋಣ. ಇನ್ನು ಹತ್ತೆಕರೆಯನ್ನು ಬೇರೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡೋಣ. ಆದರೆ ಅದೇ ರೈತ ತನ್ನ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಜಮೀನಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಹಾಕದೆ ಪಟ್ಟಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಇನ್ನೊಂದುಕಡೆ ಬೇರೆ ಆಸ್ತಿಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ಅಥವಾ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಹಣವನ್ನಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇರೆ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ—ಮನೆಯ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಇನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ—ಆಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅಂಥದನ್ನು ಕ್ಯೆಬಿಡುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ಇದು ಕ್ರಾಂತಿಕಾರಕವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ, revolutionary ಆಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

1-30 P.M.

ನಾವು ರೆವಲ್ಯೂಷನರಿಯಾಗಿ ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ, ಆಸ್ತಿಯೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಒಟ್ಟಾಗಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಒಬ್ಬ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಮನೆ, ಇಷ್ಟು ಜಮೀನು ಇರಬೇಕು, ಇಷ್ಟು ದುಡ್ಡಿರಬೇಕು, ಎಂದು ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ಆಗ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಸಮನಾದ ಕಾನೂನು ತಂದ ಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಅದು ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಮೂಲ ಭೂತವಾದ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ. ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲದೆ ರೈತರಿಗೇ ಒಂದುಸಾರಿ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನು, ಅಮೇಲೆ ವರ್ತಕರಿಗೇ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನು, ಬ್ಯಾಂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವಿಟ್ಟಿರುವವರಿಗೇ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನು ತರುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯ ಕೂಡ ಅಲ್ಲ.

ಕಾಂಪೆನ್ಸೇಷನ್ ಇನಾಂದಾರರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಂಪೆನ್ಸೇಷನ್ ಯಾವರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು 18ನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದುಮಾಡಿತ್ತು. ಮೂರನೆಯ ಛಾಪ್ಟರಿನ 15, 16, 17 ಮತ್ತು 18ನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್‌ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ವಿಚಾರ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. 18ನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದೆ :—

"18 (1) component parts of basic annual sum of an inam village shall be the aggregate of the sums specified below, less the deduction specified in section 19:—

(i) in the case of an inam village to which

(*a*) survey and settlement has been introduced under section 113 of the Land Revenue Code, the whole of the gross assessment on all lands including lands in the *khas* possession of the inamdar."

ಇದು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದುದು. ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ಕೆಲವು ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ 16ನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ :—

Section 16 as reported by the Select Committee :

"Amount of compensation payable.—

(1) Save as otherwise provided in Section 25, the total compensation payable in respect of any inam shall be the aggregate of the sums specified below :—

(i) a sum equal to twenty times the amount of rent derived by the inamdar concerned from Kadim tenants entitled to be registered under section 4 ;

(ii) a sum equal to seventy-five per centum of the amount payable by the permanent tenants of the inamdar under sub-section (2) of section 5 in respect of lands of which they are entitled to be registered as occupants under sub-section (1) of the said section 5."

and so on. ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೆಲವು ಸಬ್‌ಕ್ಲಾಜುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಡಿಫೈನ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಕೆಲವು ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ನಮೂದಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒರಿಜಿನಲ್ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಜಮೀನು ಯಾರದೇ ಆಗಲಿ, ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ ಆಕ್ಯುಪೈ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಖದೀಂ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ ಅನುಭವದಲ್ಲಿರುವುದೇ ಆಗಲಿ, ಕ್ಯಾಸಿ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ ಅನುಭವದಲ್ಲಿರುವುದೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಇನಾಂದಾರನ ಅಧೀನದಲ್ಲಿರುವುದೇ ಆಗಲಿ, ಇವೆಲ್ಲಕ್ಕೂ "gross assessment of all lands including lands in *khas* possession of the inamdar" ಎಂದು ನಮೂದಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

"The gross assessment of all lands" ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಜಮೀನು ಯಾರ ಅಧೀನದಲ್ಲೇ ಇದ್ದರೂ ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟು ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಸೆಸ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಧಾರದಮೇರೆ 20ರಷ್ಟು ಇನಾಂದಾರರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದೆ. ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ತಮ್ಮ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಅಂತಸ್ತಾಗಿ ವಿಂಗಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಖದೀಂ ಚೆನೆಂಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ 20 times the amount of rent derived from the said kadim tenant ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಚೆನೆಂಟ್ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲೇನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದರೆ: "a sum equal to seventy-five per centum of the amount payable" ಎಂದು ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಚೆನೆಂಟ್ ಇನಾಂದಾರನಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ ಮೊತ್ತವೆಷ್ಟು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ 5ರಲ್ಲಿ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಚೆನೆಂಟಿನಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾದ ಮೊತ್ತವೆಷ್ಟು ಎಂದು ನಮೂದು ಮಾಡಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಆ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇದೆ:—

"Sec. 5: (2) In addition to the annual land revenue payable in respect of the land, a permanent tenant entitled to be registered as an occupant under sub-section (1) shall be liable to pay to the Government, as premium for acquisition of ownership of that land, an amount equal to such number of multiples of the land revenue payable in respect of the land or such basic value per acre of the land, whichever is more....."

ಹೀಗೆ ಒಬ್ಬ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಚೆನೆಂಟ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಡುವ ಹಣದ ಶೇಕಡ 75 ರಷ್ಟನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇನಾಂದಾರನಿಗೆ ಕಾಂಪೆನ್ಸೇಷನ್ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಮತ್ತು ಅದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ—

"16 (iii) a sum calculated at the rates specified below in respect of lands referred to in clause (iii) of sub-section (1) of section 6 or section 8.

(*a*) 75 rupees per acre within the municipal limits of the Cities of Bangalore, Mysore and Davangere and within an area of one mile from such limits;

(*b*) 40 rupees per acre within the municipal limits of the towns of Kolar, Tumkur, Chitaldrug, Shimoga, Bhadravati, Chickmagalur, Hassan and Mandya and the limits of the Kolar Gold Fields Sanitary Board Area, and within an area of one mile from such limits; and

(*c*) 20 rupees per acre in all other areas;"

ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇನಾಂದಾರರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ ಪರಿಹಾರವನ್ನು ನಿಗಧಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ವಿಂಗಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಹಿಂದೆ ಒರಿಜಿನಲ್ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಾಗದೆ ಇರುವ ಒಂದು ಹೊಸ ಕ್ಲಾಸನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇದೆ—

"(iv) a sum equal to twenty times the jodi, quit-rent or other amount, if any, of like nature, derived by the inamdar concerned from persons holding minor inams under such inamdar;"

ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮೈನರ್ ಇನಾಂದಾರರಿಂದ ಇನಾಂದಾರರಿಗೆ ಏನೇನು ಬರುತ್ತಿತ್ತೊ ಅದನ್ನೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕಾಂಪೆನ್ಸೇಷನ್ ರೂಪವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಒಂದು ಹೊಸ ಕ್ಲಾಜನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಹಿಂದಿನ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಮೈನರ್ ಇನಾಂದಾರರಿಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ನಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಂಪೆನ್ಸೇಷನ್ ಕೊಡುವುದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಇನಾಂದಾರರಿಗೂ ಅದೇ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಕಾಂಪೆನ್ಸೇಷನ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಎರಡು ಸಾರಿ ಕಾಂಪೆನ್ಸೇಷನ್ ಕೊಡುವ ನಂದರ್ಭ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ನಮೂದಿಸಿರುವ ಹೊಸ ವಿಧಾನದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇನಾಂದಾರರಿಗೆ ಕಾಂಪೆನ್ಸೇಷನ್ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಲೆಕ್ಕಾಚಾರಮಾಡಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಈ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ತಮ್ಮ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನೂಚಿಸಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಒಂದು ಫೈನಾರ್ಷಿಯಲ್ ಮೆಮೋರಾಂಡಂ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿಸಿತ್ತು. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟು ಮಾತ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಇನಾಂದಾರರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ನಮೂದು ಮಾಡಿತ್ತು. ಈಗ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಇನಾಂದಾರರಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ಕಾಣಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. ಶ್ರೀ ರಾಮರಾಯರು ತಮ್ಮ ಭಾಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಇನಾಂದಾರರಿಗೆ ಕಾಂಪೆನ್ಸೇಷನ್ ಬಹಳ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗಬಹುದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ಕಾಂಪೆನ್ಸೇಷನ್ ಹಿಂದೇನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಒರಿಜಿನಲ್ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಂಟೆಂಪ್ಲೇಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೋ ಅದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಬಹುದೆಂದು ಊಹೆಮಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ಈ ಕ್ಲಾಜನ್ನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆಮಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ದುಡ್ಡು ಲೆಕ್ಕಾಚಾರದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಫೈನಾರ್ಷಿಯಲ್ ಮೆಮೊರಾಂಡಂ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ. ನಮಗೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಅದನ್ನು ಈಗಲಾದರೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒದಗಿಸಿದರೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ಶಿಫಾರ್ಸು ಮಾಡಿರುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಂಪೆನ್ಸೇಷನ್ ಇನಾಂದಾರರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

(ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ದೇವರಾಜ್ ಅರಸ್.)

ಆ ಮೇರೆ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಚಾರ. ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾರ್ಕೆಟ್ ವ್ಯಾಲ್ಯೂನಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡ 50 ಭಾಗ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿತ್ತು. ಅದೇ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಶೇಕಡ 50 ರಷ್ಟು ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾಂಪೆನ್ಸೇಷನ್ ಕೊಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಇನಾಂದಾರರಿಗೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ವಾದ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಮಾರ್ಕೆಟ್ ವ್ಯಾಲ್ಯೂ ಈಗಿನ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿದೆ. ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹಣ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಬರುವುದು. ಇನಾಂದಾರನಿಗೆ ಶೇಕಡ 75 ಭಾಗ ಕಾಂಪೆನ್ಸೇಷನ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಮ್ಮಿತಿಯವರು ಶಿಫಾರ್ಸು ಮಾಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇನಾಂದಾರರಿಗೆ ಕೂಡಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆಂಬ ವಾದವಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಮೊದಲು ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾರ್ಕೆಟ್ ವ್ಯಾಲ್ಯೂನಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡ 50 ಭಾಗ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಾಗ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡ 75 ಭಾಗ ಇನಾಂದಾರನಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ, ಇದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಆಗ ಒಟ್ಟು ಜಮೀನು ಕಂದಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ 20 ಭಾಗ ಗ್ರಾಸ್ ಅಸೆಸ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟು ಭಾಗ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು, ಖಡ್ಡೀಂ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಮೊದಲು ಹೇಳಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇನಾಂದಾರರಿಗೆ ಯಾವರೀತಿಯ ತೊಂದರೆಯೂ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಮೊದಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದಹಾಗೆ ಫೈನಾನ್ಷಿಯಲ್ ಮೆಮೊರಾಂಡಂ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿ ಕೊಡದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಬಹುಶಃ ಮೊದಲು ಇನಾಂದಾರರಿಗೆ ಕಾಂಪೆನ್ಸೇಷನ್ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೋ ಅದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಊಹೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ರೀತಿಯ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸಿಯಲ್ ಮೆಮೊರಾಂಡಮ್‌ನ್ನು ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ತಮ್ಮ ವರದಿಯ ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಿಬಂಧನೆ ಕೂಡ ನಮ್ಮ ನಡೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದು ಮಾಡಿದೆ. Rule 50 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly states :

> "(1) A Bill involving expenditure shall be accompanied by a financial memorandum which shall invite particular attention to the clauses relating thereto and shall also give an estimate of the recurring and non-recurring expenditure involved in case the Bill is passed into law."

ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಚಾರ ಇನಾಂದಾರರು ತಾವು ಖಾಸ್ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಬಾಗಿ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟರ್ ಮಾಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಗೊತ್ತಾದ, ನಿಗದಿಯಾದ ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಮೊದಲಿನ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದು ಮಾಡಿತ್ತು. 7ನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳಿತ್ತು :

> "Inamdar to be registered as occupant of khas lands.—Every inamdar shall, with effect on and from the date of vesting, be entitled to be registered as an occupant of all lands in his khas possession :
>
> "Provided that no inamdar of an unenfranchised inam village shall be registered as an occupant of lands in his khas possession unless he pays to the Government, as premium, an amount equal to twenty-five times the difference between the jodi or quit-rent, if any, paid by him and the land revenue payable in respect of such lands."

ಈ ಪ್ರಾವಿಸೋವನ್ನು ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ತಮ್ಮ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಕೈ ಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಕೈ ಬಿಟ್ಟಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇನಾಂದಾರರು ತಮ್ಮ ಖಾಸ್ ಜಮೀನಿಗೇ ಆಗಲೀ, ತಮ್ಮ ಅನುಭವಕ್ಕೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಯಾವ ಜಮೀನಿಗೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ ವಿಧವಾದ ಕಾಂಪೆನ್ಸೇಷನ್ನೂ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ ವೆಂದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.— ಅದು ಯಾವ ಸೆನ್ಸ್‌ಷ್ಟ್?

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ದೇವರಾಜ್ ಅರಸ್.—7ನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನು.

Section 7 in the original Bill contemplates the inamdar to pay to Government a certain amount as premium, which will be equal to twenty-five times the difference between the jodi or quit-rent, if any, paid by him and the land revenue payable in respect of such lands.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.— You please refer to Clause 6 of the Bill as amended by the Joint Select Committee:

> ".....Provided that no holder of an unenfranchised minor inam shall be registered as an occupant....."

Sri D. DEVARAJ URS.—Clause 6 refers to "lands and buildings to vest in the holder of a minor inam to which the Act is applicable." It does not include the inamdar who is allowed to possess khas lands or such of those lands, on which he should have paid compensation to Government.

ಈ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇನಾಂದಾರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಹೀಗೆ ಬಿಡಕೂಡದು. ಹಿಂದೆ original ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತ ;

ಇನ್ನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ concession ಏನನ್ನೂ ಕೊಡ ಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ; ಮೊದಲಿಗಿಂತಲೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನು ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರ ವರದಿ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇನಾಂದಾರರಿಗೇ ಹೋಗುವಾಗ ಹಿಂದೆಯಿದ್ದ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದು ಮಾಡಿರುವಂತೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಗೊತ್ತಾದ ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಇನಾಂದಾರರು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಸರಿ. ಈ ಕ್ಲಾಜನ್ನೂ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ತೆಗೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನೋ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಆಮೇಲೆ ಮೈನ್‌ಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಕ್ವಾರಿಗಳ ವಿಚಾರ. ಕೆಲವು ಇನಾಂದಾರರುಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ಜಮೀನುಗಳಲ್ಲಿರ ತಕ್ಕ ಕ್ವಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಮೈನ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ತಾವೇ work ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಮೇಲೆ ಇವು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಿಬಿಡುತ್ತವೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿದ ಹಣ ನಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ತಮಗೇ ಬಿಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇನಾಂದಾರರುಗಳು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ; ಇನಾಂದಾರರು ತಮಗೆ ಆ ಹಕ್ಕು ಇರುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲ ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ನಷ್ಟವಾಗಲಾರದು. ಈಗಲೂ ರೈತವಾರಿ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯಿರುವಕಡೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಜಮೀನುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆಯಾ ಜಮೀನುಗಳಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕ್ವಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಮೈನ್ಸ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ರಾಯಲ್ಟಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅದರ ಅನುಭವವನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದೇ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಇನಾಂದಾರರುಗಳಿಗೂ ಈ ಕ್ವಾರಿಗಳ ಮತ್ತು ಮೈನ್ಸ್‌ಗಳ ಉಪಯೋಗವನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ನಾನು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಆಮೇಲೆ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟುಗಳು ಯಾವ ಕಾಂಪೆಸೇಷನ್ನನ್ನೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಡಲೇ ಕೂಡದು, ಯಾವ ಕಾಂಪೆಸೇಷನ್ನೂ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಕೆಲವರು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಭೂ ಸುಧಾರಣಾ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರೂ ಕೂಡ ತಮ್ಮ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟುಗಳೂ ಏಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾಂಪೆಸೇಷನ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಮಾಡಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ:

On page 28 of the Report of the Committee for the Revision of the Land Revenue System, it is said:

> "Kadim tenants and Permanent tenants to be treated as registered occupants after the village vests in Government on abolition of Inam tenure."
>
> "On the abolition of the Inam tenure of an Inam village, the rights of the superior holder will be extinguished and the village will vest in Government. It becomes, therefore, necessary to decide as to who should be treated as 'registered occupants' in respect of the several lands, in holding, at the time the village vests in Government. The tenants in an Inam village fall into three groups, *viz.*, Kadim tenants as defined in Section 84 of L. R. C., Permanent tenants as defined in Section 79 of the L. R. C. and Tenants-at-will who will comprise of all tenants other than Kadim and Permanent tenants. The rights of Kadim and Permanent tenants are not affected even if the Inam village is forfeited under Section 54 of the L. R. C. and on the abolition of Inam tenure of the village, they may become registered occupants, under Government, of the lands held by them. So far as the Kadim tenant is concerned, the rent paid by him to the Inamdar is equal to the land revenue assessment and he will continue to pay the same assessment to Government As there is neither an improvement in his status or rights nor a reduction in the amount to be paid by him after the acquisition of the village by Government, there appears to be no necessity to recover any premium from him for treating him as a 'registered occupant'."

ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಖದೀಂ ಟೆನೆಂಟುಗಳು ಯಾವ ವಿಧವಾದ ಕಾಂಪೆಸೇಷನ್ನನ್ನೂ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಅದೇರೀತಿ ನಾವೂ ಕೂಡ ಕಾನೂನು ರಚಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದೆ:

> "The rent payable by a permanent tenant to the Inamdar need not necessarily be equal to the assessment on the land and though the tenancy is heritable, it is not transferable, without the consent of the Inamdar. If a permanent tenant is treated as the registered occupant of his holding, after abolition of the Inam tenure of the village, he gets the right of alienation and the annual payment will also be limited to the survey assessment on the holding."

ಕದೀಮ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ ತನ್ನ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಎಲನೇಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇದ್ದಂಥ ಒಂದು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲೂ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇನ್ನು ಮೇಲೆ ಆತ ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟರ್ಡ್ ಆಕ್ಯುಪೆಂಟ್ ಆದ ಮೇಲೆ ಕದೀಮ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟಿಗೆ ಇರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ತನ್ನ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಇತರರಿಗೆ ಪರಭಾರೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆತನಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ದೇವರಾಜ ಅರಸ್.)

ಬರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಈ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಆತನಿಗೆ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಸಿಗುವುದರಿಂದ, ಈ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೇ ಆತ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಕಾಂಪೆನ್ಸೇಷನ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಆ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದು ಮಾಡಿದೆ.

> "We consider that he should pay some premium for these additional rights and we recommend that ten times the assessment on the holding may be recovered from a permanent tenant who becomes a registered occupant under Government on the abolition of Inam tenure of the village."

ಹೀಗೆ ಅವರು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಕಂದಾಯದ ಮೊಬಲಗಿನ ಹತ್ತರಷ್ಟನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ವಸೂಲ್ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು, ಅದನ್ನು ಪುರಸ್ಕಾರ ದ್ರವ್ಯಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿಸಿರುವ ವರದಿಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ ಎಂಬಾತನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಎಷ್ಟು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ (5) ಒಳಪ್ರಕರಣ (2) ರಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಹಿಂದಿನ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂದಾಯದ 10ರಷ್ಟು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರು; ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗುತ್ತೆಂದು ಕೆಲವರು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದರೆ ಹಾಗೆ ಈ ಒಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಜಮೀನುಗಳಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ಧಾನ್ಯಗಳಿಗೂ ಇದ್ದ ಬೆಲೆಗಳಿಗಿಂತ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಅವು ಬಹಳವಾಗಿ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್‌ಗಳಿಂದ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮೊಬಲಗನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಕೊಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದು ಅಷ್ಟು ತಪ್ಪಾಗಲಾರದೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಷೆಡ್ಯೂಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವ 15ರಷ್ಟು, 20ರಷ್ಟು ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾಗಿದೆ, ಅದರಂತೆ ಕೊಡಲು ಯಾವ ಅಭ್ಯಂತರವೂ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಆದರೆ ನಾವು ಈ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಏಕಾಏಕಿ ಈಗಿರುವಂತೆಯೇ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನಾಗಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಸೂಕ್ತ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಮಾಡಿ ತಂದರೆ ಆಗ ನಾವು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು. ಇಲ್ಲವಾದರೆ ನಾವು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಕೊಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದರೆ ಈಗ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ಯಾವ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿದೆಯೋ ಅದೇ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿ ನಾನು ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಕ್ತಾಯಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ಆರ್. ರಾಮಯ್ಯ (ಬನವನಗುಡಿ).— ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಮೈನೂರು ಪರ್ನನಲ್ ಮತ್ತು ಮಿನರೇನಿಯಸ್ ಇನಾಂ ಅಬಾಲಿಷ್ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ನಡೆದಂಥ ಚರ್ಚೆಗಳೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿದೆನು. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿದ ಭಾಷಣಗಳಿಂದ ಅನೇಕರಿಗೆ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇದ್ದಂಥ ಅನೇಕ ಸಂದೇಹಗಳು ಪರಿಹಾರವಾಗಿವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ.

ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಿಂದ ಪ್ರಥಮತಃ ಖದೀಂ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಎಂಬ ಒಂದು ತರಗತಿಯ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್‌ಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಉಪಕಾರವಾಗಿರಬಹುದು. ಇನ್ನುಳಿದ ಬಾಕಿ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್‌ಗಳ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ಕ್ಯಾಸಿ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್‌ಗಳು ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ಮೊಬಲಗಿನ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚಾಸ್ಪದ ಕ್ಕೊಳಗಾದ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಅನೇಕವಾಗಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಇನಾಂದಾರನಿಗೆ ಖಾಸ್ ಪೊಸೆಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಂಥ ಜಮೀನುಗಳನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಉಳಿದ ಜಮೀನುಗಳನ್ನು ಆತನಿಗೆ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಧಾರವಾದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯವರು ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಂಥ ಖಾಸ್ ಜಮೀನುಗಳ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರಿಗೆಷ್ಟು ಜಮೀನುಗಳನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು, ಮತ್ತು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕಾಂಪೆನ್ಸೇಷನ್ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು, ಎಂಬ ವಿಷಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಭಿನ್ನ ಭಿನ್ನವಾದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳು ಬಹಳವಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿರುತ್ತವೆ.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.]

ಆದರೆ ನಾವು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ನೋಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದ ಅಂಶ ಏನೆಂದರೆ— ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತರಲು ಇದ್ದಂಥ ಮೂಲ ಉದ್ದೇಶವೇನಿತ್ತೋ ಅದು ಈಗ ಸಾಧಿಸಿದಂತಾಗಿದೆಯೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಪರ್ಯಾಲೋಚಿಸಿ ನೋಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದರ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮೂಲೋದ್ದೇಶವೇನಿರುತ್ತೆಂದರೆ ಯಾರೂ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಮೊದಲಿನಿಂದಲೂ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡಿಕ್ಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿರುತ್ತಾನೋ ಅಂಥವನಿಗೇ ಈ ಜಮೀನುಗಳು ಸೇರಬೇಕೇ ಹೊರತು ಇದರ ಪ್ರತಿಫಲಗಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ರೈತರಿಗೂ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಇರುವ ಮಧ್ಯವರ್ತಿ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಗದಂತೆ ತಡೆಗಟ್ಟಬೇಕೆಂಬುದೇ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಇದೇ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಮುಖ್ಯೋದ್ದೇಶ. ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಬಿ. ಗುಂಡಪ್ಪ ಗೌಡರ ಸಮಿತಿ ವರದಿ ಮತ್ತು ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಿಫಾರಂ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ವರದಿ ಈ ಎಲ್ಲದರಲ್ಲೂ ಈ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನೇ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಲಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿರುವುದು ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯ; ಯಾವುದೆಂದರೆ ಕಾಂಪೆನ್ಸೇಷನ್ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರ. ಈ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಮತ್ತು ಕ್ಯಾಸೀಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ ಈ ಎರಡು ತರಗತಿಯವರು ಭೂಮಿಗೆ ಮಾಲೀಕರಾಗತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅವರು ಎಷ್ಟು ಮೊಬಲಗನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಲಾಗಿದೆಯೋ, ಅಷ್ಟು ಮೊಬಲಗನ್ನು ಈಗಿನ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಕೊಡಲು ಸಮರ್ಥರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನೂ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ನಾವು ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ನೋಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಮತ್ತು ಸಹಾನುಭೂತಿಗಳು ಎಷ್ಟೇ ಇದ್ದಾಗ್ಯೂ ಸಹ ಕ್ಯಾಸಿಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮೊಬಲಗನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೋ, ಅಷ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಚೈತನ್ಯವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದು ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಖದೀಂ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸಿನ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ತೊಂದರೆಗಳೂ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಏನೂ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಖದೀಂ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್‌ಗಳು ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಅವರೇ ಸ್ವಂತ ಜಮೀನ್ದಾರರಾಗುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಂಥ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಆ ಕ್ಯಾಸಿ ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಮತ್ತು ಪರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಟೆನೆಂಟ್ಸ್‌ಗಳಿಗೆ ದೊರೆಯುವಂತೆ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಅನುಕೂಲತೆಗಳನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡಿರುವಂತೆ ಕಂಡು ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರಿಂದ ಕಾಂಪೆನ್ಸೇಷನ್ ಪಡೆಯು

ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಕಾರಣ ವೇನೆಂದರೆ ಅವರ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಅಷ್ಟು ಉತ್ಕಟವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಈ ಕಾಂಪೆಕ್ಷೇಷನ್ ತೆರಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂತಲೇ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

2 P.M.

ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ಎರಡುಮೂರು ಸಾರಿ ಪುನರಾವರ್ತನೆಯಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದು ನಮಗೆಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ತಿಳಿದಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯ. ಪ್ರಾರಂಭದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಕೆಲವು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಮೆಮ್ಮೊರಾಂಡಮ್ ಆಫ್ ಡಿಸೆಂಟ್ಲ್ಲಿ ಅಕ್ಟೋಬರ್—ನವೆಂಬರ್ ಸೆಷನ್ 1951ರಲ್ಲಿ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ಈ ಸಂಬಂಧವಾಗಿ ಏನು ಒಂದು ವರದಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೋ ಅದಕ್ಕನುಸಾರವಾಗಿಯೇ ಇದೆ. ನಾನು ಅದನ್ನು ಆದಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಓದಿನ್ತೇನೆ. ಆ ವರದಿ ಕೊಡುವಾಗಲೂ ಆ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಮ್ಮ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಯಾವ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ ಪರಿಹಾರವೂ ಈಗ ಈ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲೂ ಇಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತು ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಅದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಗಮನಿಸಬೇಕು.

"Out of 2,110 inam villages in the State, it could be gathered that the recorded value in 800 villages is Rs. 500 and below; of these villages, it is seen that the recorded value in 30 villages is Rs. 100 and below; of 450 villages Rs. 200 and below; of 270 villages Rs 300 and below; of 189 villages Rs. 400 and below and of 141 villages, Rs. 500 and below.

"Out of this amount and other sources of income, if any, has to be deducted jodi, etc., and also the annual remuneration payable to village officers at scales prescribed by Government whether such officers are employed by the inamdar or not.

"Further in assessing the compensation payable, the Bill has not considered the several improvements of permanent nature such as constructing tanks, embankments, anecuts, lift irrigation facilities."

Adequate compensation should be given to jodidars for the above.

ಆಮೇಲೆ 2,110 ಇನಾಂ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಸೆಟ್ಲ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಸುಮಾರು 500—600 ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಬಾಕಿ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಸೆಟ್ಲ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಸೆಟ್ಲ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ನರಿಯಾಗಿ ಆಗದೆ ರೈತರು ಆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಸ್ವಂತವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಮೊಬಲಗು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದು ಅಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಉಳಿಯುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಅಸೆಸ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ನರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಿರ್ಧರವಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳಿಗೂ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಅಸೆಸ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಇಷ್ಟು ಅಂತ ವಿಧಾಯಕ ಮಾಡಿ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಈಗ ಮೇಲೆ ನಾವು ಒಂದು ಆಶೀರ್ವಾದ ರೂಪವಾಗಿ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾಗಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ತಕರಾರುಗಳು ಬಂದು ಆ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ತೊಡಕುಗಳು ಉಂಟಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಿಂದ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಉಂಟಾಗತಕ್ಕಂಥ ತೊಂದರೆ ಲಿಟಿಗೇಷನ್ ಎಷ್ಟು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಬಹುಶಃ ಆ ರೈತರು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಮೊಬಲಗು, ಅವರು ಈ ಜಮೀನುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಅದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಬಹಳವಾಗಿ ಲಿಟಿಗೇಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಖರ್ಚಾಗಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಷಯ ಏನೆಂದರೆ ಈ ಖಾಸ್ ಪೋಸೆಷ್ ವಿಷಯ. ಈ ಇನಾಂದಾರರಿಗೆ ಅವರ ಇನಾಂತಿಗಳನ್ನು ರದ್ದುಗೊಳಿಸುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಪರಿಹಾರ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗಿನ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಕಂಡುಕೊಂಡು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಪರಿಹಾರವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಒಂದೇ ಒಂದು ಬಾರಿ ಪರಿಹಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟುಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಅವರು ಆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್‌ವೆಸ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಅದರ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಬಹುದು. ಆ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಚೈತನ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಅಷ್ಟು ಉತ್ತಮವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಪರಿಹಾರದ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಅನೇಕ ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಂಚಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಬಹಳ ತೊಂದರೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರಿಗೂ ತೊಂದರೆ ರೈತರಿಗೂ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ವ್ಯಥಾ ತೊಂದರೆಮಾಡಿದಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ತೊಂದರೆಗನುಗುಣವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನ ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮತ್ತು ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಇನಾಂ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಖಾಸ್‌ಪೊಸೆಷ್ ಬಿಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ವಿಷಯ ನಿಗದಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೆಲವರಿಗೆ ಏನೂ ಉಳಿಯದೇ ಇರಬಹುದು, ಕೆಲವರಿಗೆ ಅಲ್ಪಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಉಳಿಯಬಹುದು. ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನರಿಯಾದ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಮಾಡಿ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಇನಾಂತಿಯ ರೈಟ್ಸ್ ನೋಡಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಉಳಿಯುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬ ಅಂಕಿಅಂಶ ಯಾವುದೂ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಈಗ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಭೂದಾನ ಯಜ್ಞ ಮತ್ತು ಭೂಮಿಯ ಮಾಲೀಕತ್ವ, ಅಗ್ರೇರಿಯನ್ ರಿಫಾರ್ಮ್ಸ್ ಈ ವಿಷಯಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಒಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸಮಾಲೋಚನೆಗೆ ಬಂದಿವೆ. ಈಗ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಒಂದು ಭಾವನೆ ಎಂದರೆ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ರೈತನಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು, ಅವನು ಸ್ವಂತವಾಗಿ ಜಮೀನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, Absentee landlords ಎಂದು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇವೆಯೋ ಅದು ಹೋಗಬೇಕು, ಎಂದಮೇಲೆ ಒಬ್ಬ ಮನುಷ್ಯ ಎಷ್ಟು ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ತಾನೇ ಸ್ವಂತ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ಆರ್. ರಾಮಯ್ಯ.)

ವಾಗಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ವ್ಯವಸಾಯಮಾಡಬಲ್ಲ, ಎಷ್ಟು ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಅವನು ಜೀರ್ಣಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದು ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ವಿಷಯ. ಇದು ಬಹಳ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ. ಅನೇಕ ಜನ absentee landlords ಆಗಿ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಐದು ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನಿದ್ದರೂ ಒಬ್ಬ absentee landlord ಆಗಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅವನಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಜಮೀನು ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಿಗದಿಮಾಡಿ ಒಂದು ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಲಿಮಿಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ, 25, 10 ಅಥವಾ 5 ಎಕರೆಮಾಡಿ, ಇಷ್ಟೇ ಜಮೀನು ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ವಿಧಾಯಕವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅರೀತಿ ವಿಧಾಯಕಮಾಡಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಾವಿರ ಎಕರೆ ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಹಂಚಬಹುದು. ಇನಾಂತಿ ಜಮೀನುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಖಾಸ್‌ಪೊಸೆಷ್ಷ ಎಷ್ಟು ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನು ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ವಿಧಾಯಕ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯ ಏನೆಂದರೆ ಈ ಇನಾಂತಿಗಳು ಯಾವಕಾಲದಿಂದ ಬಂತೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಮೂಲತಃ ಈ ಜಮೀನುಗಳನ್ನು ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೋ ಅವರ ಅನುಭವದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಕೈಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಈಚೀಚೆಗೆ ಅನೇಕರು ಆ ಇನಾಂತಿ ಜಮೀನುಗಳನ್ನು ಖರೀದಿಗೆ ಕೊಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಮತ್ತು ಕೆಲವರು ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ನೀವು ಪರಿಹಾರ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಮಾರ್ಕೆಟ್ ರೇಟ್ ಎಂದು ಏನಿದೆಯೋ ಅದು ಆಗಿನ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಂಡು ಕೊಂಡರೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಗುಣವಾಗಿದೆಯೇ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮತ್ತು ಜಮೀನು ಬೆಲೆ ವಿಷಯ. ಅದು ವರ್ಷ ವರ್ಷಕ್ಕೂ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಾಗುತ್ತ ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಕಳೆದ 20--25 ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಜಮೀನುಗಳ ಬೆಲೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಮಾರ್ಪಾಡಾಗಿದೆ, ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ಹೊಂದಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ತಿಳಿದ ವಿಷಯ ಬಹುಶಃ ಇನ್ನುಮುಂದೆ ಆ ಜಮೀನುಗಳ ಬೆಲೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಂಥ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಪರಿಹಾರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಇನಾಮ್‌ದಾರರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ ಪರಿಹಾರವನ್ನು ಇನ್ನು ಹತ್ತಾರು ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂತಿನಮೇಲೆ ನಾವು ಹಂಚುತ್ತಾ ಹೋದರೆ, ಮುಂದೆ ಬೆಲೆ ಏಷ್ಟಿರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಒಂದು ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಒಂದೇ ನಲ, ಬಾಂಡ್‌ಗಳ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲೋ ಅಥವಾ ಇನ್ನಾವ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲೋ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ವಿಷಯ.

ಇನಾಮ್‌ದಾರರುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಪುಷ್ಟರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಕೊಬ್ಬಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅನುಕೂಲ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅನೇಕರು ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅನೇಕರು ಬಡವರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಇನಾಮ್ ಜಮೀನಿನಿಂದಲೇ ಜೀವನ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂಥವರಿಂದ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಅವರನ್ನು expropriate ಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ ಪರಿಹಾರ ದ್ರವ್ಯವನ್ನು ಇನ್ನು ಹತ್ತುಹದಿನೈದು ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂತಿನಮೇಲೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾ ಬಂದರೆ, ಅವರು ಜೀವನ ಹೇಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು? ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಮನೂದೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆದಿದ್ದರೂ ಇದು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ತೃಪ್ತಿಕರವಾಗಿದೆ, ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಇದರಿಂದ ಶೇಕಡ ನೂರ ರಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ನ್ಯೂನತೆಗಳಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿರುವ ಈ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಪುನಃ ವಿಮರ್ಶೆಮಾಡಿ, ಇದರಲ್ಲರತಕ್ಕ ಕುಂದುಕೊರತೆಗಳನ್ನೂ, ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕುಂದುಕೊರತೆಗಳನ್ನೂ, ನಿವಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಿ, ಪುನಃ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ತಂದರೆ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಬಹಳ ಉಪಕಾರವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ನಾನು ನಂಬಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur)—Sir, I did not want to participate in the debate concerning the abolition of personal inams. Discussions have been going on for the last one week and these have been actually working on my nerves. Sometimes, I feel that instead of abolishing the Inams, they are going to abolish Imam (*Laughter*).

Sir, I must confess that I have no personal experience of the working of Inams or Jodi villages. Fortunately or unfortunately, the District of Chitaldrug, and particularly the taluk of Jagalur from which I come, is free from these ancient institutions. I think Jagalur has not got a single institution which I could visit and gain personal knowledge. Since I had no personal knowledge of the working and since I could not verify myself whether Inamdars were in the wrong or the tenants were in the wrong, I thought there would be no need for me to participate in the debate. But taking into consideration the turn that the debate is taking, I feel it my duty to contribute to the discussions.

Before proceeding further, I would like to ascertain from the Hon'ble Minister for Revenue whether he has come to any tentative conclusions in consultation with the various opinions expressed in this House. If he has succeeded in coming to an unanimous decision in consultation with the various gentlemen who expressed divergent views, I think, it is better for him to place those views.....

An Hon'ble MEMBER.—There are amendments.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I think the Hon'ble Minister for Revenue said just now and somebody else also remarked that they have come to an unanimous agreement as to what provisions should be implemented and

what provisions should be omitted. If that is so, it will facilitate discussion. Otherwise, if I offer my views now.....

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER.—Sri Imam, Hon'ble Members have made many observations. You cannot expect the Hon'ble Minister to have come to definite conclusions and give a definite reply. Moreover there are amendments tabled. When the amendments are taken up, the Hon'ble Minister will reply.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I thought the Hon'ble Minister invited some members with a view to discuss among themselves as to what they should do.

Sir, the abolition of Inams has been engaging the attention of the State from a very long time and actively since 1948. Prior to 1948, various committees were appointed. I think there was one committee appointed in the year 1915 or 1918 which submitted certain proposals to the Government. Again, there was another committee appointed in the year 1932, which submitted various proposals and one of these proposals was that survey settlement should be introduced in all the Inam villages. But this recommendation was not pursued fully. Though survey settlement was introduced in nearly seven thousand villages, the other villages are left in the same old state. As a result of this, it is stated by one section that the Inamdars are harassing the tenants and that the tenants are being ill-treated by the Inamdars. There is another version that the tenants in their turn have not been discharging their duties or obligations to the Inamdars, which they ought to do. I was told by many members that these tenants have been creating a good deal of trouble to the Inamdars by non-payment of rent or kist, and whatever they are expected to pay to the Inamdars. This has been pointed out in the Gundappa Gowda Commiteee Report. There are allegations made by both sides. Whatever it may be, the Gundappa Gowda Committee have stated unequivocally that these Inams and these institutions should go and Inams should be abolished.

I may also state that there is unanimity of opinion in this House regarding the abolition of inams This is the major issue and there is no difference of opinion from any section of this House. When there is unanimous opinion regarding the major issue, it looks surprising that the consideration of this Bill should have taken such a long time. It has taken a record time, nearly one week, and we have not come to any decision. I do not know how long it will continue !

Sri N. HUCHMASTHY GOWDA.—We will finish it today.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I do not know what will happen. All this trouble is due to the cause that all of us scrutinise and discuss it too much. Sir, the point of difference can be confined to only two or three aspects. The main point of controversy, if I remember correctly, is centered round the definition of the tenants who are of three classes, namely, kadim tenant, permanent tenant and quasi-permanent tenant or tenants-at-will. Regarding kadim tenant, there is no controversy and his rights are assured. Permanent tenant is defined under Land Revenue Code as one whose possession continues during the tenure of holding. But this definition formerly did not include quasi-permanent tenant. The Gundappa Gowda Committee defined the quasi-permanent tenant as one who has been in enjoyment of the land for a period of six years prior to the year 1948. Supposing, Sir, if the Bill seeking to abolish inams had been introduced immediately after the Report of the Gundappa Gowda Committee was submitted, perhaps all these complications would not have arisen. But the pity is that it has taken such a long time. Since 1948 to 1954, it is nearly six years. Government have taken six years to sponsor this Bill and to put into effect the recommendations of the Gundappa Gowda Committee and they have still not succeeded in this. We are where we were.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH (Maddur).—Where else can we go ?

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Sir, this Bill was introduced in the year 1950. There was very heated discussion. Many members took part and various suggestions were thrown out. But

(Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.)

suddenly the Government did not want to pursue this matter further. We did not hear anything subsequently. When a Bill is introduced, it is the duty of the Government to pursue it logically and see that it becomes a law. They should not be half-hearted. They should not introduce a Bill unless they are satisfied that it is going to be supported by all the sections of the House. But such half-hearted measures will always land the Government in trouble Another thing that I want to suggest is this. Certain conventions should be followed, specially when we appoint a committee to consider an important matter like this. Government appointed a Committee under the Chairmanship of Sri Gundappa Gowda. The Committee consisted of many members of this House, members representing various sections of the House. They took a reasonably long time, they considered the views expressed by various interests, they sent a questionnaire, consulted many persons who offered their evidence and after considering all these, they submitted an interim report to Government. In fact, they were anxious that the inams should be abolished soon and that is why their first duty was to submit an interim report to Government for further action. Government took some time in preparing a Bill and afterwards introduced it. Sir, my humble opinion is this. When a committee is appointed by Government and when the committee after good deal of trouble submits a report to Government, it is wise for the Government and it is prudent that they accept the report of the committee in all material particulars. This is a convention and tradition to be observed because that Committee is supposed to be an expert committee. It consisted of persons who are experts...

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Supposed to be experts.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—It is an expert committee.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Sir, he said, 'supposed to be an expert committee.'

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—The Committee consisted of:—

Janab Mohamed Khalilulla
Sri H. M. Channabasappa
,, S. Narayana Rao
,, A. G. Bandi Gowda
,, H. K. Veeranna Gowdh
,, H. R. Guruv Reddy
,, S. K. Venkataranga Iyengar
,, T. Thimmarayappa
,, K. Pattabhiraman
,, S. Avala Reddy
, B. L. Narayanaswamy
,, V. Venkatappa
,, D. S. Mallappa
,, M. Govinda Reddy
,, O. Veerabasappa
,, K. G. Vodeyar
,, H. S. Rudrappa
,, Bagamane Devegowda
,, Chenniya Vodeyar
,, G. A. Thimmappa Gowda
,, C. T. Hanumanthaiya
,, Rama Sharma
,, Belur Srinivasa Iyengar
,, S. M. Siddayya
,, Mali Mariappa
,, A. C. Mallegowda

This is a very big committee. Many of the members who served in that committee are now members of this House. Even now the present members are: Sri Mali Mariappa, Sri C. T. Hanumanthaiya, Sri H. S. Rudrappa, Sri V. Venkatappa, Sri K. Pattabhiraman, Sri G. A. Thimmappa Gowda, Sri H. K. Veeranna Gowdh. That means, the entire Congress Party represented there. So many members who were on that committee are also members of this House and they are experienced members. When the membership is so common, I cannot understand the delay and why there should be any hesitation in accepting the report of this Committee. It is only when we deviate from the recommendations of that Committee, we will land ourselves in trouble If we deviate from the recommendations of that Committee, I must say, we will be paying very poor compliment to them. It is a tradition and a convention that when Government appoints a special committee it means it has full confidence in that committee and the

report that comes from that committee must be accepted. Otherwise, if the Government wants to put its own ideas, if the members of the House want to put their own ideas, then complications arise.

Sri V. VENKATAPPA.—That Committee was not appointed by this House.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I may also state another instance because Sri Venkatappa interrupted, that is, the District Boards Committee of which Sri Venkatappa was the chairman, which was appointed by Government and various members of this House were asked to serve in that committee. Sri Venkatappa and his colleagues took a lot of interest, they examined many persons as witnesses and they submitted a valuable report. If the Government and the members of this House had full confidence in that committee, if they had adopted the report of that committee and given effect to it, then Government would not have been in the present state of trouble.

2-30 P. M.

So they disregarded the recommendations of that committee and they wanted to introduce their own changes and the members of this House also did not want to show due courtesy to the recommendations.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—May I just interrupt ? You know that the Venkatappa Committee Report was considered and an Act was passed by the Legislative Assembly and it had to be given effect to. At that time, the new House came into being. Then the members were at liberty to express their opinion. Therefore the Government permitted them to reopen the question. It is not as if the Members did not enjoy the confidence of the House.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—This House is or the old House was at liberty to accept it or not accept it. I say that by tradition and convention we will be travelling on safe ground by accepting the report of a competent committee. If you don't do so, I said you will be in perpetual trouble and complications will arise. This is one example. Supposing this House had accepted that Report and the legislation which was passed had been pursued ; then all the complications would not have arisen and now the Government are put to the necessity of appointing another Committee under Sri D. H Chandrasekharaiya and they are considering what to do and I do not know what the fate of the Report of that Committee will be. My submission is this : that whenever a committee is appointed to consider a particular subject and that committee sends a report to the Government, it is but right, I think, that all the members of this House must adopt that report as if it has come from an expert body. On the other hand, if we go on dissecting and torpedoing the recommendations of the committee and if we offer our own views, then we will never reach a decision. Fresh complications will arise and the Government will not be able to discharge its duty. After all, what are the points of difference that have been expressed. Differences, as I said, are centered on three points. Now regarding the definition of tenant-whether a quasi permanent tenant should have enjoyed possession for 12 years or 6 years, the Gundappa Gowda committee Report recommended that any tenant who has been in possession of land for six years prior to 1948 must be treated as a registered occupant. The original Bill also incorporated the same principle. But the Select Committee made this change : they laid down that a tenant to be treated as an occupant must be in possession for 12 years. This is one point of difference. The second is regarding khas possession. The Gundappa Gowda Committee Report states that an inamdar who has been in possession of lands for six years must be treated as the occupant of those lands, excluding communal lands such as gomal or forest. The Bill also went a little further and they adopted those recommendations and reduced the period to three years. But the Select Committee according to some has made it wider and the recommendation made by the Select Committee is objected to on the ground that according

(SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.)

to this recommendation, the inamdar will gain much more than what he would have got if the provision under the original Bill had been passed. They apprehended that the inamdar would get not only lands in his khas possession but also all other lands which would otherwise have vested in the Government. This is the second point of difference. The third point of difference lies with regard to compensation. Some people feel that the compensation to be awarded is high and some people feel it is not very generous. These are the only fundamental differences that have arisen, and my own opinion is that the recommendations made by the Gundappa Gowda Committee are very reasonable and they must be adopted. Any tenant who has been in possession of lands for six years prior to 1948 must be treated as a permanent tenant and all the rights that accrue under this Act must be conferred on him. Of course, the Revenue Minister was pleased to state: 'What about those who have come to be in possession after 1948? It is quite possible that after 1948 the old tenants might have been dispossessed and new tenants must have been put in possession. There will be a conflict. So under such circumstances, what are the steps to be taken; does it really work as a hardship on some tenants? But either way it does work as a hardship. Even if you adopt six years' period, it will be a hardship to new persons that will come in; or if you adopt 12 years, it will be a hardship to old tenants. But when both the measures are attended with some difficulty, then it is wise to adopt the suggestion given by an expert committee and so far as this is concerned, I recommend the suggestions made by the Gundappa Gowda Committee may be accepted and the tenants may be treated according to that recommendation.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—That means, without this restriction of six years prior to 1948?

SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I said that whatever recommendations are made by the Gundappa Gowda Committee, they may be accepted.

Regarding compensation, I would like to be a little more generous to inamdars. After all, whatever may be their actions or whatever may be their attitude, I must submit that the party that is affected must be treated with a certain amount of generosity. It must be remembered that many inamdars are going to be divested of the privilege of property which they enjoyed for centuries. It must also be remembered that to many inamdars this was their sole means of sustenance and livelihood and when we deprive them of their means of livelihood it is but right that we are a little generous to them and that they are given at least as much as will enable them to lead a respectable life. Let them not curse this measure we have taken. Here again I would like to be guided not only by the Gundappa Gowda Committee Report but also by what is happening outside the State. In the Madras State, the zamindari system was abolished and they have given compensation to the persons that were affected. These are the scales prescribed:

Where the basic annual sum does not exceed Rs. 1,000.	Thirty times such sum.
Where the basic annual sum exceeds Rs. 1,000 but does not exceed Rs. 3,000.	Twenty-five times such sum or Rs. 30,000 whichever is greater.
Where the basic annual sum exceeds Rs. 3,000 but does not exceed Rs. 20,000.	Twenty times such sum or Rs. 75,000 whichever is greater.

These were the scales of compensation allowed in the State of Madras. The Gundappa Gowda Committee recommended a little reduction. (*Interruption*). Conditions may differ in States which are very far off. Let us take the conditions prevailing in the neighbouring State because the conditions are quite similar to the conditions here. The Gundappa Gowda Committee recommended twenty-five times as against thirty times where the net annual income does not exceed Rs. 1,000 ; twenty times the net annual income when it exceeds Rs. 1,000 but does not exceed Rs. 3,000 as against twenty-five times and fifteen times for sums exceeding Rs. 3,000 as against twenty times in Madras. In the Bill it was still further reduced and the Select Committee also has adopted quite a different principle. They want to arrive at compensation on quite a different principle ; that is, to allow 75 per cent of the value paid by the tenants.

I do not know how far this will work, and whether the Government have compared the rate of allowance recommended by them with the rate of allowance recommended by the Committee. But I suggest, let us be a little generous and accept the recommendation made by the Inam Abolition Committee in respect of the allowance that may be paid to the Inamdars. They must be treated fairly because it is only they that lose substantially and not we and I suggest that we need not be unduly harsh and whatever compensation has been recommended by the Government may be given to them. I think these are the only three points of difference and if all of us make up our minds, let us give consideration to the report ; let us take it into consideration and let us adopt the principles laid down in the report unanimously. I do not think there will be any trouble. I think we all can come to a unanimous decision. On the other hand, if every member puts forward his own way of interpretation, then it will be very difficult for us to come to a unanimous understanding.

There is another thing regarding financial implication. The abolition of all inams in the State will impose a heavy financial burden on the State. I do not know whether the Government at this juncture will be in a position to discharge its financial obligations properly and not to the detriment of other activities. It is stated here that they need nearly one crore and eighty lakhs of rupees to be paid by way of compensation and this has to be divided into ten equal instalments. That means to say, every year, they have to make provision in the Budget for about 18 lakhs of rupees. We know the position of Budget now. The Chief Minister yesterday presented the Budget ; he has disclosed a deficit of Rs. 309 lakhs and in my opinion it may increase t about Rs. 4 crores. The Chief Minister has also suggested a series of new taxation measures which have given a rude shock to the entire State and as such, I would like to know from the Government as to how they are going to discharge the financial liability year by year especially when our finances are so very bad. I feel, personally, we can pass this Bill and enter this enactment in the Statute Book. Not that I am opposing, but I am only suggesting as a practical measure that if the Act is to be implemented in the State, it will impose an additional burden on the State to the extent of nearly 18 to 20 lakhs ; if there is miscalculation, it may exceed that figure. I do not know what compensation has been proposed for Yelandur and other various Jahgirs and inams. The figure of Rs. 180 lakhs seems to me to be only a conservative estimate and the implementation of this Act will impose heavy burden on the State. I would like to khow from the Government what measures they are going to adopt and what is the relief they are going to give. This is a very important matter to be considered by the Government especially in view of the financial position. So, Sir, with these observations, I hope that this Bill will come to a speedy conclusion because really we have taken much more time than is necessary, *i.e*, nearly one week and the Revenue Minister will have sufficient farsight and forethought to adopt various measures that have been suggested in the Committee's report.

*Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Sir, I was listening to the debate for nearly a week. Several points were raised by the Hon'ble Members. As summarised by the Leader of Opposition the points of difference, the points of dispute hinge on three questions, namely, the question of compensation, the question of conferring occupancy rights to the tenants and the question of how much should be given to the Inamdar. It is worth while recalling to our memory the history of this Bill. The Leader of the Opposition found fault with the Government for not implementing the recommendations of the Gundappa Gowda Committee early. The Committee under the chairmanship of Sri Gundappa Gowda was appointed in the year 1948, and the report was given to Government in the year 1951. Before the final report was submitted, the Government enacted an Act known as the Mysore Alienated Villages (Protection of Tenants and Miscellaneons Provisions) Act, 1950. After this Act was passed in the year 1951, the Inam Abolition Bill was introduced in the Assembly. That Bill envisaged the abolition of not only personal inams but also Sringeri Jahgir. There was plenty of discussion on the Bill. The Bill was referred to the Select Committee. The Select Committee after hearing several interests submitted its report to the Assembly in October 1951. Before the report of the Select Committee could be considered by the Assembly, it was dissolved in view of the General Elections. After the General Elections, no doubt, we have taken sufficient time. The present Bill was introduced. To avoid unnecessary controversy and delay, we excluded religious inams from the purview of this Bill. You know, Sir, the exclusion of religious inams was objected to by the Hon'ble Members who spoke on the Bill. Therefore, we have introduced a separate Bill. Sir, in a measure of this type, where there are conflicting interests, it is very difficult to arrive at a solution which is satisfactory to all the parties. The Joint Select Committee which considered this Bill had met 14 times for nearly 4 hours or 5 hours or 6 hours everyday. After taking into consideration all aspects, the Select Committee thought that the report now presented to the Hon'ble House was the best under the circumstances. Sir, it is difficult to paint a picture. After the picture is painted, it is easy to find fault with the picture. I quite see the point. There is room for criticising the Bill and also the report of the Select Committee. After all, the members who considered the Bill cannot assume that they are the most intelligent people on earth. There is no perfect piece of legislation in any country. The Hon'ble Members who spoke mostly dealt with the question from the point of view of the tenants. Most of the Hon'ble Members have told that the tenants' interests have not been sufficiently safeguarded by the Select Committee. No doubt some others spoke to the effect that the Inamdar should be treated fairly and he should be treated as if we would have treated him if he were a zamindar owning *circar* lands. The main question, as I was telling, is the question of tenants. Inam lands from the point of view of cultivation could be classified in four or five groups. First is the land cultivated by the inamdar personally. The second category comes under those groups of lands that are being cultivated by the kadim tenants. The third variety of lands are those lands cultivated by permanent tenants. The fourth variety of lands are those cultivated by tenants-at-will or tenants other than kadim tenants and permanent tenants. There is the fifth variety of land which is not being cultivated by anybody like building sites, communal lands like gomal, forest, tank-beds and waste lands. With regard to the right of the kadim tenant to be registered as occupant there is no dispute at all. He is bound to be registered as occupant without paying any upset price or compensation to Government. As regards permanent tenants, there is no dispute even. If he is a permanent tenant he cannot be evicted under any circumstances. Therefore he is entitled to be registered as occupant. Much was made of the distinction that is said to have been removed by the Select Committee

*Asterisk indicates that the speech has not been revised by the Member concerned.

between the permanent tenant and the quasi-permanent tenant. Some members have also criticised the Members of the Select Committee on the ground that they have departed from the recommendations of the Gundappa Gowda Committee. Sir, these are the main recommendations of the Gundappa Gowda Committee. I do not want to read and take away your valuable time.

A VOICE.—Please read them.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—"Outright abolition of inam tenure of inam villages on payment of compensation..." "Interim management of Inam villages by Government." "After the inam village vests in Government on abolition of the inam tenure, a kadim tenant should be treated as registered occupant under Government..." "Permanent tenant should also be treated as the registered occupant of the lands over which his permanent tenancy extends..." "Inamdar may be treated as registered occupant of the lands to whose cultivation he has personally attended for a continuous period of six years prior to 1st July 1948. A tenant-at-will who has cultivated any land continuously for a period of six years prior to 1st July 1948 should be treated as registered occupant under Government, subject to non-alienation for a period of six years..." "Lands which have not been cultivated continuously for a period of six years prior to 1st July 1948 either by the inamdar or by a single tenant will vest in Government..."

These are the main recommendations of the Gundappa Gowda Committee.

Sir, in the Bill as placed originally, provision had been made for registering not only kadim tenant and the permanent, but also the quasi-permanent tenant and also the inamdar. In the Bill, a tenant who cultivated land for a period of six years continuously prior to 1948 was defined as a quasi-permanent tenant. In the report of the Select Committee, with a view to bring a large number of persons within the definition of permanent tenants, we enlarged the definition of permanent tenants, not without any idea, because according to the recommendations of the Gundappa Gowda Committee according to the original Bill, all those tenants who continuously cultivated the land for a period of six years prior to 1948 were called quasi-permanent. In the report of the Select Committee that class has been eliminated and the definition of the permanent tenant has been enlarged. In the improved category of permanent tenants, all those persons who cultivate land continuously for a period of 12 years prior to the date of vesting— naturally in respect of the Bill, the date of vesting will be 1954—therefore all these persons who were continuously cultivating for a period of six years prior to 1948 will come under the category of permanent tenant provided they had not been evicted unauthorisedly by the inamdar. We took into consideration that aspect also, namely where the inamdar can have unlawfully evicted the tenant who was there on 1st July 1948 as quasi-permanent tenant. In the year 1950, as I have already told, there was an enactment known as "the Mysore Alienated Villages (Protection of Tenants and Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, in which there is a section which deals with the protection of tenants in inam villages:

> "Notwithstanding anything contained in any law for the time being in force or any contract between parties, no suit shall lie for the eviction of any tenant in an alienated village who has been holding or has possession of any lands or land used for purposes of agriculture uninterruptedly from 1st day of July 1946, nor such tenant shall be evicted in pursuance of any decree or the order of a court or otherwise."

So, after this Act came into force in 1950, no tenant could be evicted unlawfully by the landlord. The committee took into consideration this aspect and we assumed that all those tenants who were quasi-permanent tenants on 1st July 1948 must have continued to cultivate the land up to date. If they had been evicted subsequent to 1st July 1948, there was this Act to help them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Prior to that date, if they had been evicted illegally ?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—This Act provides for those tenants who would have been evicted subsequent to 1946.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—If the tenant had been evicted prior to 1948 ?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Such cases were not taken into account either by the Gundappa Gowda Committee or in the Bill.

Now, the Hon'ble Members who spoke in favour of the tenants said.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—How long is the Hon'ble Minister likely to take ?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—About 45 minutes more, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—You can continue after lunch. The House will now rise for lunch and meet at 3-30.

The House adjourned for Lunch and reassembled at Thirty Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Sir, I was submitting the reasons for doing away with the class of those tenants who were defined as quasi-permanent tenants. I was telling that all those tenants who were there prior to 1948 as quasi-permanent tenants are bound to continue up to date or presumed to be tenants up to date unless they were evicted unauthorisedly by the Inamdar. If they had been evicted unauthorisedly subsequent to 1948, there was this law, namely, the Act of 1950, the Mysore Alienated Villages (Protection of Tenants and Miscellaneous Provisions) Act of 1950, to protect their interests. They could have sought redress with the competent authorities under this Act.

That apart, Sir, I have no objection to retain the definition of quasi-permanent tenant. It makes very little difference. The only serious objection for the present definition of permanent tenant is that a tenant who is generally lacking in documentary evidence will be unable to prove that he was a tenant continuously for a period of twelve years. I see the force of that argument.

Next, coming to the problem of other tenants, there is really difference of opinion on that point. Some people have argued that all those tenants, irrespective of the duration of their tenancy, should be registered as occupants and that the Inamdar should be registered as occupant of only that area which was in his *khas* possession. There is no dispute about the proposition or the idea that tenants who were cultivating the land for a period of six years prior to 1948 should be registered as occupants. 1948 is the period during which the Government thought of land reforms. And it is quite probable that many of the inamdars who did not think that Government would bring a legislation to abolish inams might have evicted some tenants who were there as tenants prior to 1948. Therefore, the point boils down to whether we should lay emphasis on the proposition that all those tenants who were quasi-permanent tenants prior to 1948 should be protected or tenants who came to the scene subsequent to 1948. Sir, I am of the view that tenants who had cultivated for a period of not less than six years prior to 1948 should be protected and they should be registered as occupants. As regards tenants who began to cultivate the lands subsquent to 1948, they do not deserve the same concession because either they must have been responsible in collusion with the inamdar to evict the tenants who were there prior to 1948 or the inamdar must have created new tenancies in respect of lands in his khas possession. I suppose, I have made the point clear. Therefore our attention should be focused on the question of safeguarding the interests of these tenants who were there prior to 1948. Sri Devaraj Urs and few others said that we should not discriminate between the Zamindar owning Government land and an inamdar holding inam in an alienated village. They said, I believe Sri M. V. Rama Rao said, that in many cases

the original inamdar or his descendants have sold away the right and the inam land has been purchased by a third person for valuable consideration and they should not be put to unnecessary loss on account of this legislation. Though I am not entirely in agreement with them, there is some force in what they say. Especially in malnad, there are small holders who are owning not more than 15 to 20 acres and most of them are purchasers from the original inamdars or his descendants. Such persons will have to be dealt with fairly. Therefore, I am of the view that all these persons who were there as quasi-permanent tenants on 1-7-1948 should be registered as occupants and as regards the other tenants, they will get tenancy rights under the inamdar. Now that the Tenancy Act has been extended throughout the State, all these tenants will be tenants under the inamdar. They cannot be evicted according to the Tenancy Act now in force, for a period of five years from now or from 1-1-1954. Government is also considering amendments to the Tenancy Act and in that amendment we propose to enhance the period of lease and we also propose to fix a sort of ceiling limit for the landlord to own lands. Though this is not relevant for the purposes of this Bill I only pointed out that the...

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA.—What is the ceiling limit for inamdars holding lands, Sir ?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—I was talking about the Tenancy Act Amendment Bill which we are considering. We have not come to a final decision with regard to that. I only brought it to the notice of the House to show that we are interested in the other tenants who did not come under the category of permanent tenant or kadim tenant or quasi-permanent tenant.

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA.—Have Government any idea as to the extent of land to come under the ceiling limit, Sir ?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—We are considering the question ; we are actively considering. As regards permanent tenants, some Hon'ble Members have rightly pointed out that they have got a right to be in posession of the property undisturbed irrespective of transfer of property from the inamdar to some other person. They have also urged that the upset price to be paid by a permanent tenant should not be the same as that payable by the quasi-permanent tenant. There is considerable force in that argument. Some Hon'ble Members, I think Sri Bheemappa Naik and Sri M. V. Rama Rao said that the word inam has not been defined properly either in the Bill or in the Select Committee Report. I wish to draw the attention of the Hon'ble Members to section 1, clause (3) and also to section 2, clause (1). Section 1, clause (3) reads like this :

" It applies to—

(*a*) personal inams including the Yelandur Jahgir ;

(*b*) Khayamgutta villages ;

(*c*) Kodagi and Bawadi Daswandam inams ;

(*d*) miscellaneous service inams including artizan inams, and excluding village service inams held by Shanbhogs and Patels, Thotis, Talaris and Nirgantis.

Explanation : 'Personal inam', 'Kodagi or Bawadi Daswandam inam,' 'artizan inam' or 'miscellaneous service inam' means a grant of a village, portion of a village, land or total or partial exemption of land revenue entered as 'personal inam', 'Kodagi or Bawadi Daswandam inam', 'artizan inam' or 'miscellaneous service inam', as the case may be, in the alienation register kept under section 51 of the Land Revenue Code."

In section 51 of the Land Revenue Code provision has been made to keep a register and to make an entry of all inams in that register. Therefore, the definition made is adequate and there is no apprehension that there will be further complication on account of any omission in this respect. Some Hon'ble Members have pointed out that the Select Committee have omitted to include in the Amendment proposed that provision of the Bill which provided for the payment of compesnation or premium by the inamdar to the Government.

(Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.)

I wish to draw the attention of the Hon'ble Members to the proviso to section 6 where it is said :

"Provided that no holder of an unenfranchised minor inam shall be registered as an occupant under this sub-section unless he pays to the Government, as premium, an amount equal to twenty-five times the difference between the jodi or quit-rent....."

This payment of premium does not arise in the case of jodi villages, because all the jodi villages are enfranchised inams. Sri Devaraj Urs said that no provision has been made for payment of land revenue by the inamdar in respect of the lands which are going to be registered in his name.

Sri D. DEVARAJ URS.—I wish to clarify. It is not with regard to the land revenue, but with regard to the lumpsum compensation that is to be paid by the inamdar. Here the proviso in section 6 refers to minor inams.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—I have already explained that the question of payment of premium does not arise in the case of major inams, in jodi villages. It was intended to cover only minor inams.

Sri D. DEVARAJ URS.—As we know, in the original Bill it includes inams also.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—It was intended to cover all those cases of inams. But I have explained the matter by saying that the question of payment of premium does not arise in the case of jodi villages because all the jodi villages are enfranchised inams. They can be changed even to-day.

Sri D. DEVARAJ URS.—Does it mean that even the inclusion of payment of that premium to the Government was not correct even in the original Bill ?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—It was correct because it was intended to cover only minor inams. If the Hon'ble Member reads the Bill once again, he will be convinced.

Sri D. DEVARAJ URS.—With your permission, may I draw the attention of the Hon'ble Minister to section 7?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—I have gone through it. "Inamdar to be registered as occupant of khas lands." It does not say 'minor inams.'

Sri D. DEVARAJ URS.—.—It includes inamdars.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Though it included inamdars, the intention was to cover only cases of minor inams which were unenfranchised.

Coming to the question of compensation, it was urged by some Members that the compensation provided is inadequate and some Members said that it is more than adequate and that the inamdars do not deserve the compensation provided in the Select Committee Report. As I have already submitted on an earlier occasion, the Bill is simplified. We are not going to pay compensation for the lands which will be registered in the name of the inamdar as occupant. Therefore, the State is going to save that much by registering the inamdar as an occupant of all the lands which are not being cultivated either by the kadim tenant, permanent tenant or quasi-permanent tenant, or the communal and the forest lands. In the original Bill, compensation had to be calculated on the basis of the land revenue payable in respect of all the lands including forest and also gomal, communal lands and lands which were in the khas possession of the inamdar. Multiple of that land revenue after deducting cesses, etc., was the compensation payable. I would like to draw the attention of the Hon'ble Members to section 18 of the original Bill :

"18. (1) *Component parts of basic annual sum of an inam village.*—The basic annual sum of an inam village shall be the aggregate of the sums specified below, less the deduction specified in section 19.—

in (i) the case of an inam village to which.—

(*a*) survey and settlement has been introduced under section 113 of the Land Revenue Code, the whole of the gross assessment on all lands including

lands in the *khas* possession of the inamdar;

(*b*) survey and settlement has not been introduced under section 113 of the Land Revenue Code, one and one-third times the recorded value of the village as per the inam settlement;

(ii) the whole of the average net annual income derived by the inamdar from forests in the inam village during a period of five years immediately preceding the date of vesting."

Therefore, forest, gomal, waste lands, lands which were in the *khas* possession of the inamdar had to be taken into account in determining the compensation. Now in the Report of the Select Committee, Government is liable to pay compensation in respect of lands which are going to be registered in the name of the kadim tenant, permanent tenant and quasi-permanent tenant. I have conceded that point. I am agreeable to retain that definition of 'quasi-permanent tenant'. In the case of kadim tenant we are liable to pay twenty times the land revenue. In the case of other tenants, as provided in the schedule; that is, 15 times, 20 times dependant upon the condition of the land and the kind of the land. I do not think this compensation is too much. No doubt the inamdars had to go; we will have to deal with them.....

Sri D. DEVARAJ URS.—The Hon'ble Minister seems to depend upon guess work only so far as the compensation that is to be paid by the Government to the inamdars is concerned. In the original Bill there is a clear financial memorandum given and we know the exact amount that is to be paid by the Government by way of compensation to the inamdars; whereas in the Select Committee Report, the changes, he seems to say, are likely to bring down the amount of compensation that is to be paid by Government. But nothing prevents me from concluding that it may go up. In the absence of proper statistics I am as much open to conclude that the compensation that is to be paid by Government will go up. For that we want statistics; not mere imagination.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—To some extent it is guess work. Even in the original financial memorandum it is an estimate. We are not aware of the exact number of permanent tenants that may come under the definition that we have made in the Bill. It is to some extent a guess work, I concede; but on principle it is a matter of calculations. Take an extent of 100 acres and apply this principle and that principle; it is more advantageous; you can find for yourself. I have calculated. I think from the point of view of the State, the present principle adopted by the Select Committee is more advantageous because in respect of lands.....

4 P.M.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—What the Member wanted to know was what would be the compensation that we would have to pay in the altered position, that is, in accordance with the Bill as emerged from the Select Committee. There is a different position altogether. It is quite different from what it was originally. At least in the same way as they had previously estimated, they could have estimated now and given a financial memorandum. That is what the Hon'ble Member Sri Devaraj Urs wanted to know. If they have not given it already, at least even to-day it is not too late; let them give us a probable estimate, a very rough estimate of what the Government will stand committed to. That is all the position, Sir.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Sir, I have got some figures given by the Secretariat. But I am not sure whether those figures are correct. It is a rough estimate. According to the original Bill, the extra cost to Government was about Rs. 150 lakhs. Now according to the report of the Select Committee, it is Rs. 105 lakhs.

Mr. SPEAKER.—So, it is less?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Yes. I was submitting that in respect of the lands in possession of kadim tenants, we

(SRI KADIDAL MANJAPPA.)

are paying as compensation to the Inamdar only 20 times the land revenue and as against that we are going to collect every year land revenue from the Kadim tenant. Even for argument's sake, if I concede the proposition that the definition of the permanent tenant as contained in the Original Bill should be retained, we may say that we are going to pay 20 times the land revenue in respect of those lands that are going to be registered in the name of the permanent tenant. We are going to collect land revenue every year and we are paying 20 years' land revenue as compensation to the Inamdar. So, in respect of other lands that are going to be registered in the name of quasi-permanent tenants, supposing he pays to us as an upset price 20 times or 30 times as provided for in the Schedule, 75 per cent of it we propose to give to the inamdars as compensation. So, what is the net loss to the State? In respect of those lands which are going to be registered in the name of quasi-permanent tenants, I have already conceded that I have no objection to retain that definition; the State is not going to lose anything. We are going to save 25 per cent to make good the loss we may sustain towards compensation which we may have to pay in respect of those lands which we are going to register in the name of permanent tenants and kadim tenants. In respect of forest, gomal and other land, we are not going to pay to the inamdars the market value of those lands. After the inam is vested in the State, forests, gomal and communal lands will become the property of the State. We are paying compensation to the inamdar 10 times the average net income he used to derive for a period of five years prior to the date of vesting or some such thing. For 5 or 10 years, we are paying the income we derive. Supposing there is forest belonging to Yelandur Jahgir. We get the income from it every year and we pay the inamdar for 10 years. So, in respect of those lands either quarries or forests, there is no loss to the State. In respect of lands which are going to be registered in the name of quasi-permanent tenants, there is no loss to the State. So, on the whole, the State is to be benefited after the period of 10 years. From this point of view, the report of the Select Committee is advantageous.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR (T-Narsipur).—One clarification. Will the State pay from its funds towards compensation?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—For the present, for 10 years and it will derive income afterwards.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Will not the State get a different rate of levy under the Land Revenue Code?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—We have to pay compensation.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—The compensation you pay out of the amounts paid by the permanent tenants.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—In the case of quasi-permanent tenants, compensation will be covered by the upset price payable by the quasi-permanent tenants. In the case of permanent and kadim tenants, the State will have to pay from its funds in the beginning.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—It is only in the case of kadim tenants and not in the case of permanent tenants. Even permanent tenants are paying compensation.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Will not the land in the possession of the Inamdar at present, after this Bill is passed, be subject to full levy of land revenue?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Yes.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—So, will not Government get increased revenue?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—To some extent.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—So, the Government are not paying out of their funds.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—In the beginning they will have to pay.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Why did the Government depart from the recommendations of the Gundappa Gowda Committee, page 44, about compensation?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Because the inamdar will be benefited on account of the other lands being registered in his name. In respect of lands that are going to be registered in the name of Inamdar, we are not going to pay any compensation. He is going to be benefited to that extent. According to the recommendations of the Gundappa Gowda Committee, the Inamdar was entitled to be registered as an occupant only in respect of those lands which are in his *Khas* possession; but here, according to the report of the Select Committee, apart from the lands held by these three classes of tenants, all the other lands in the possession of tenants-at-will and those lands in his *khas* possession will go to him.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I want a little clarification. The Inamdar was required to pay a certain amount of jodi to Government. The jodi was based on the records of land known as the Inam Settlement Commission of 1881 and the record value refers to the entire acerage in that village, and therefore the inamdar was paying assessment and he was enjoying certain concession. But with regard to this loss of income, is it not necessary to compensate that loss of income in accordance with the recorded value as noted in 1881 ?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—He gets his compensation 10 times the average net income he was getting in respect of forest and other lands.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—From Kadim tenants ?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—From kadim tenants he was getting only land revenue and he must be satisfied with 10 or 20 times the land revenue.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—He was getting the land revenue from all people whether he was a kadim tenant or a permanent tenant. He was getting land revenue from kadim tenant : he was getting gutta either in cash or kind from other tenants. In respect of that village from whatever he collects he retains certain things for his livelihood and pays certain fixed amount to Government in addition to having maintained the village officers and people according to law. So, should this loss in income which would accrue now after the introduction of this Bill, not be compensated as such ? Why should the Government take only one portion, the income-yielding portion and leave the rest ?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA —Hereafter, he will not be under any obligation to maintain officers or officials to manage his affairs.

One thing should be borne in mind. The inamdar is an alienee to collect land revenue. He stands on the same footing as Government stands in a Government village. In an unalienated village, the Government is the superior holder entitled to collect the land revenue. In an alienated village the inamdar is occupying the position of the Government. Therefore, difference has to be made between an ordinary occupant and an inamdar. Inamdar cannot be compared with an ordinary occupant. He is entitled to certain rights only, the rights of collecting land revenue. Therefore, I submit that the compensation provided in the Report of the Select Committee is very fair and reasonable ; and we have gone a step further and we are going to make the registered occupant of those lands subject to the rights of tenancy of the cultivators in respect of those classes of tenants who are called tenants-at-will. To that extent, he must be thankful to Government and this House if this is approved. And if in spite of these concessions the inamdars are not satisfied, I would only appeal to them to study other Acts which are in force in other States. We have made a comparative study of all the enactments in force in other States and we have come to the conclusion that the compensation we have provided in the Bill is very reasonable.

Sir, after listening to the speeches of Hon'ble Members, I have thought that there is some force in the contention of some Hon'ble Members. Accordingly, I have proposed certain amendments to Bill. I have also taken into consideration the amendments tabled by some members of this House.

(SRI KADIDAL MANJAPPA.)

I think the amendments I have proposed will meet the important objections raised by the Hon'ble Members. If the Speaker permits me, because I have not tabled amendments in time, I suppose, I will move the amendments after the Consideration Motion is passed. The amendments are agreed to by most of the Members whom I have had occasion to consult unofficially.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Sir, we are taken by surprise so far as these amendments are concerned. We have had no time to study them.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN (Kolar).—The amendments are not before us yet.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That the Mysore (Personal and Miscellaneous) Inams Abolition Bill, 1954, as reported by the Joint Select Committee be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Business of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What shall we do regarding amendments? Shall we take them up today or tomorrow?

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—We may take them up tomorrow, Sir.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—The Opposition Members were also consulted three days back. They knew that these amendments were going to be made. Why not we take them up today and be done with it, Sir?

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I have no objection.

Sri K. PATTABHI RAMAN.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one submission with regard to the point at issue, Sir. Now, the motion for consideration of the Select Committee Report has been passed and we are guided by the rules. You have been given here, in the Rules the kind of motions that be could made after the Select Committee Report is presented to the House. New amendments are not contemplated there. But I do not certainly stand in the way of the Speaker exercising discretion or this House giving leave. But I should like to say that this should not be quoted as precedent hereafter. As it is a question of procedure, I leave it to you, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We will take up these amendments tomorrow. There are some minor bills; they may be taken up now.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Even in respect of these Bills, we do now know when they are going to be taken into consideration. Amendments will have to be sent. Unless we know definitely, when these Money Bills are going to be taken up, we cannot send amendments in time.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Not the Money Bills. I did not refer to that. There are some minor Bills like the City Improvement Trust (Amendment) Bill and others. I suggested that they might be taken up.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—I want to know the definite date on which these Money Bills are going to be taken up and when we can send up amendments. Otherwise, it will be difficult.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Regarding the Bills which were introduced this morning, amendments will be received. till 3 P.M. tomorrow.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—I have a submission to make in respect of Money Bills, Sir. If they are going to be taken up now, I have a suggestion to make.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have given time till 3 P.M. tomorrow for amendments.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—Before you do that way, I want to make one submission. We have got rules 130, 131 and other Rules of Business. Of course, I may particularly refer to Rule 131. A Finance Bill means a Bill ordinarily introduced in each year to give effect to the financial proposals of the Government for the following financial year and includes a Bill to give effect to the supplementary financial proposals for any period. And these are covered by 131 (1). Then we go to 131(2) which says:

"131(2): At any time after the introduction in the Assembly of a